

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim 1, 3, 5, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 17 are being amended. Support for the amendments to independent claims 1 and 14 can be found at least in FIGs. 1-3 and paragraphs [0048] and [0049]. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-17 remain pending in this application.

Allowable subject matter

Applicant appreciates the indication that claim 4 is allowed, and that claims 5, 11, 13, 15 and 17 contain allowable subject matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10, 12, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,874,902 to Yamashita et al. (Yamashita). Claims 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,460 to Ookawa et al. (Ookawa). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, as amended, recites “at least one prism structure, each of the at least one prism structures having a first surface characterized by a first surface structure function modulated by a second surface structure function, the first surface structure function having characteristics to provide that each of the at least one prism structures has a cross section with at least two curved sides to provide defocusing diffusion to light incident on the substrate, both the first surface structure function and the second surface structure function encompassing the two curved sides, the second surface structure function having characteristics to provide additional diffusion to the light incident on the substrate.”

Yamashita fails to disclose at least a surface characterized by a first surface structure function modulated by a second surface structure function, where the first surface structure function is modulated by a second surface structure function, and both the first surface structure function and the second surface structure function encompass the two curved sides of the cross section

of the prism structures, as those first and second surface structure functions are specifically recited in claim 1.

The Advisory Action states:

Yamashita's prism structure has two curved surface structure, and light incident from the one curved surface structure are internally totally reflected by the other curved surface structure. Further, each prism has a vertical angle in a range of 50 to 70 degree. Therefore, the one curved surface structure function is modulated by the other curved surface structure according to the particular vertical angle. Furthermore, as broadly interpreted the claimed limitation, the surface structure function is random.

Presuming for the sake of argument that curved surfaces of Yamashita's prisms correspond to the first and second surface structure functions, respectively, of claim 1 (which they do not), Yamashita still does not disclose the features of claim 1. As recited in claim 1, both the first surface structure function and the second surface structure function encompass the at least two curved sides of the prism structures. By contrast, each of the functions defining a curved side in one of the Yamashita prism structures encompass only that particular side, i.e., the defining function does not encompass both of the curved sides. Yamashita fails to anticipate claim 1 for at least this reason.

Ookawa was cited for allegedly disclosing other features of the claims, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Yamashita.

Independent claim 14 recites "at least one prism structure, each of the at least one prism structures having a first surface characterized by a first surface structure function modulated by a second surface structure function, the first surface function having characteristics to provide that each of the at least one prism structure has a cross section with at least two curved sides to provide defocusing diffusion to light incident on the substrate, both the first surface structure function and the second surface structure function encompassing the two curved sides, the second surface structure function having characteristics to provide additional diffusion to the light incident on the substrate" and thus is patentable over Yamashita for reasons analogous to claim 1.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, claim 2 recites "wherein the second surface structure function is random or pseudo random." Yamashita does not disclose any second surface structure function which is random or pseudo random.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 11, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5490
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

Michael D. Kaminski
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,904

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438